

# THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Entered as second-class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879

VOL. III

NEW YORK, APRIL 2, 1910

No. 21

I have been asked on a number of occasions to indicate material available for colloquial use of Latin in the class-room. Unfortunately there is not at present a very large supply. A book is in preparation in England by Mr. Fred Winter, entitled *Handbook of Colloquial Latin with Classified English-Latin Vocabulary*, which should have appeared before this and may be expected shortly.

Until that appears, however, the most extensive book is a *Guide to Latin Conversation*, by Professor Stephen W. Wilby (John Murphy Co., New York and Baltimore), which costs about 75 cents. It contains classified lists on every conceivable topic, and subjects for discussion and dialogues, much in the form of the ordinary traveller's handbook in the modern languages. The advantage of this book is that it furnishes the modern names for a number of things and ideas which one would search for in vain in the ordinary English-Latin lexica.

*Sprechen Sie Lateinisch?* is a small German publication giving dialogues on colloquial subjects (see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* I.132).

A great deal of material can be found in Dr. Avellanus's primer, *Palaestra*, published by him at 25 Fifth Avenue, New York City. Four numbers have been issued, at 25 cents each.

Outside of these books I am not aware of any material for extended Latin conversation. For mere oral exercise in the class-room most of the recent manuals contain a fair amount of material; I may mention especially *A First Latin Course* by E. H. Scott and Frank Jones (Blackie and Sons). Grammatical terms and the jargon of grammatical discussion will be found best in such grammars as that by Alvarez, *De Institutione Grammatica* (Woodstock, Md.), written for practical use in the Catholic schools.

Meanwhile that the good work is still going on is evidenced by the following communication recently received by me, to which I invite the attention of all schools in the territory mentioned. It would be very interesting if the challenge given should be accepted and the debate should come off. I sincerely hope it will.

## CHALLENGE

As President of The Manual Training High School Classical Club of Brooklyn, N. Y., a society of boys and girls who endeavor, under the guidance of their

teachers, to use Latin as a conversational medium in their meetings, I beg leave to challenge, through the columns of your valuable publication, any High or Preparatory School in the Eastern States to a Latin debate to be held between two teams of three persons each on a topic to be chosen by common agreement.

E. Strittmatter, '10.

N. B.—Communications to be addressed to E. Strittmatter, care Miss M. A. Hall, M. T. High School, 4th St. and 7th Ave., Brooklyn, N. Y.

G. L.

## IMPROVED STANDARDS IN TEACHING LATIN<sup>1</sup>

In a delightful little book, *As Others See Us*, Graham Brooks points out the lesson the American people have been obliged to learn from painful experience; that national sensitiveness, self-assertiveness, provincial dogmatism, are of no avail to suppress adverse criticism; that criticism of ourselves constitutes the most valuable groundwork of a rational optimism; and that we have grown in the world's esteem as we have become unsparing in the judgment of our own shortcomings. From Mr. Brooks's array of significant facts, our teachers of Latin might well profit. If the results of our Latin teaching are called into question, let us abstain from recrimination and wordy denial, but in a resolute spirit of self-criticism set forth what we are accomplishing in our Latin, what we ought to accomplish, and how improvement in methods is to be effected.

The claim for the retention of a subject in the curriculum because it *has been* effective is worse than futile; its *actual* serviceability, its distinct contribution to the needs of our present-day intellectual endeavor is the issue. Superficially, we might content ourselves with the reflection that its popularity is attested in the High Schools by the numbers that take up the subject; but size of enrollment is attributable to a multitude of causes; it certainly does not indicate or assure permanent appreciation; in an age like ours of utilitarian tendencies, once that the effectiveness of the teaching of Latin is seriously questioned, there may set in suddenly a popular depreciation, culminating in an overthrow of what was once the very cornerstone of all higher education.

<sup>1</sup> Address delivered at the University Convocation, Albany, October 30, 1909, and before the New York Latin Club, November 20, 1909.

It is a timely subject, then, to consider improved standards of teaching Latin; for public criticism has formulated its objections to the spirit and the method of some of our teaching. For one, I do not deplore this critical attitude; it should redound, if duly appreciated and understood, to the benefit of the subject. A study which is bolstered merely by a tradition is in danger of becoming fossilized.

Quite recently the German gymnasia that had cherished for generations special privileges distinguishing their type of secondary school from other parallel types have admitted the baneful influence of these prerogatives; the *Berechtigungen*, as they are called in German educational literature, had fomented for many years the most bitter discussions, until in 1900 an enlightened public opinion and their own practical insight led the gymnasial party to waive all special legislation in their favor. They welcome the new era; they are prepared to show in *competition* the advantages that accrue from modified prosecution of the Latin work; they have revised the economy of their teaching, have supplemented their unequalled scholarship by a masterful analysis of teaching-method; and have practically demonstrated in their Reform-schulen that even with diminished time allowance, but with skilful correlation of effort, they can achieve as of old the required standards.

Here, it seems to me, we are to find our cue; of little avail will it be to build up a *theory* of what the study of Latin is supposed to effect; improvement in the conduct of the work will be a more convincing argument in its favor than all array of testimony. I shall certainly not attempt to sift or supplement this testimony which is at every teacher's service in the handbooks of Bennett or Dettweiler, in the forcible utterances of men like Lowell, Shorey and Bryce. Improved standards in the teaching of Latin, and the successful establishment of these standards, are the surest means of maintaining the study in its place in the curriculum.

It is surely no ground for the Latin teacher's self-complacency that the teaching of *other* subjects is reputed to be less skilfully conducted than that of Latin; whatever advantage that circumstance may have brought will disappear with the rapid systematization and elaboration of aim in these other subjects; even now the didactic practice of some modern language and science teachers may furnish suggestions of value to our classical teachers.

The improvement in Latin teaching should express itself primarily in unity of aim; the conviction is, I think, growing, that if we except the university stage of scholarly specialization and linguistic research, the entire Latin course from the initial steps through the college course should have one aim, and that a *cultural* one; this aim is to control all our teaching efforts, and the only deviations will be those

in method, which must be modified according to the age and maturity of the student.

To two phases, and two only, of the cultural aim I propose to restrict myself: (1) training in linguistic power; and (2) recognition of the vital relation between the content of Roman life and literature and our own literary and practical development. A Latin course that slights either one of these view-points is incomplete, unsatisfactory.

1. The Anglo-Saxon, more than some of the other great races of the Western world, derives, because of the nature and development of his own vernacular, special gain from the training that the Latin affords; the contrast between the structural features of the two tongues, which may be summarized as formal precision versus formless freedom, can be made a valuable adjunct to the expression of logical thought. We recognize with its obvious limitations the possibilities of our own tongue, as we undertake the process of translation, and the establishment and appreciation of constant cross-relations between the two languages enhances the power of expression.

In the period of secondary school life above all, the expansion of linguistic consciousness as a basis of thought becomes a paramount consideration. The significance of language training at this stage may well rest on Dante's simile in his *De Vulgari Eloquentia*, "Speech is not otherwise an instrument necessary to our conceptions than is the horse to the soldier".

2. But however appropriate for the earlier stages of the Latin work this formal training proves which creates the power of logical discrimination in and through language forms, we must not neglect the ulterior purpose of Latin study, that it is to be the key to the relationship between the past and the present. The contents of the Latin literature, and the records of its civilization, can be made to contribute somewhat of their significance even to the secondary school pupil; for the college stage they must be in the very center of interest. I omit entirely from consideration the plea of the unapproachable standard of perfection that is often urged in favor of the classic tongues and their literary products, not because I do not share it, but because acceptance of this belief should grow out of the student's own experiences rather than be formulated as dogma.

The two phases of this cultural aim, then, the language training and the historical relationship, adjust themselves to a natural sequence, according to which the practice of our schools and colleges should be determined. If the training in linguistic power which is gained from the accurate study of a highly inflective language promotes logical precision in and through language, then our entire energies must be centered at the outset on firmly se-

curing this accuracy; not an approximation to accuracy which leaves the tool of language uncertain and unreliable, but positive, definite grasp. Vagueness in the recognition of this need has robbed the teaching of elementary Latin of its presumptive value. Our pupils hardly succeed in emancipating themselves at any stage completely from the formal linguistic training; grammar and dictionary dominate the reading of our advanced college classes to whom the idiom should long since have become completely familiar, and who in consequence lose the quickening influence and inspiration that is born of a free survey of the literary document, unhampered by mechanical obstacles.

If college teachers of Latin really aspire to make their subject vital in the large sense of bringing into prominence its bearings upon our modern life, then their share in the necessary change can be easily stated; for they are the intellectual progenitors of successive generations of Latin teachers in the schools. It is their privilege to point out in the discussion of the Latin authors resemblance and discrepancy between ancient and modern political situations, to compare modern and ancient cultural tendencies; to illuminate the differing conceptions in home-life, in public activities, in relations of the individual to the state, in methods of administration, the standards of right and wrong, the influence of religion and of personal religiosity, the interests and processes of trade, the relation of the commonwealth to foreigners, the attitude toward slavery; all these considerations disclose the larger vistas which the future teacher will in his turn seek to make real to his pupils. Of this scope that the study of Latin literature obviously suggests our college courses do not take sufficient cognizance, and it is just here that a brief reference to needful improvement in standards of the college work seems called for. It is not the increasing difficulty or linguistic complexity of the several Latin authors that should determine the succession in which they are offered to the student; it would be invaluable for all of our students, and especially for our future teachers of Latin, if the range of connective association, indicated a moment ago, should be developed in a renewed study of comparatively simple authors from this broader, more philosophic aspect.

As matters stand, our teachers, not to speak of our students, derive little but technical insight into the language from the study of Caesar, Cicero and Vergil, and yet there are untold possibilities in the works of each of these authors which remain a sealed book to teacher and pupil. How many of our secondary Latin teachers, for instance, have so intimate an acquaintance with Holmes's *Conquest of Gaul* that they have realized, what his book reveals, the contribution that Caesar's commentaries

furnish to the ethnology of the Gallic peoples, to the tribal institutions of these primitive communities, their occupations, habits and personal appearance, the stage of their political maturity, the interpretation of their names of persons and localities, the significance of their contact with the opposing civilization of Rome?

Will any one deny that from a familiarity with these and many kindred topics there should spring a degree of interest that at present is *not* associated with our teaching of Caesar? What could an advanced student of political issues, of the conduct of public affairs, of legislative requirements, of parliamentary procedure, of the *technique* of the law not disclose to his hearers by correlating the methods of Cicero's oratory with the modern practice of forensic and legal presentation! And as for Vergil, the true revelation of his poetic power, of his consummate literary skill, which represents in a sense the accumulated poetic tradition of his predecessors, of his appreciation for pictorial and dramatic art, of his disclosure of a consistent philosophic system, all these manifestations of the great poet that made him the model and inspiration to a galaxy of great and greater poets of succeeding ages—these matters that have engaged the attention of many of the eminent European scholars of modern days, and other questions that still await elucidation—are scarcely realized by the great body of our secondary teachers and pupils.

We read Shakspeare, do we not, with our secondary pupils? But did Francis Child hesitate to interpret Shakspeare anew to his advanced students, disclosing the larger human problems, the questions of aesthetics, of structure, to which the boy and girl could not be equal?—I have studied the announcements of Latin courses in all our prominent colleges, and, except where elementary Latin courses are offered to beginners, nowhere have I discovered recognition of this need which seems to me so vital. And even in the Latin programs of our summer sessions, whose constituency is mainly the teacher in active service, eager to supplement the scanty equipment of his own preparatory and college days, I have been able to discover in but one or two cases the frank acceptance of this important principle, the application of scholarly insight to the practical demands of the class room.

From one of these few announcements I quote literally, because it embodies the point I am trying to make: "The aim of the course in Vergil will be to present these two books (1) as they should be known by the teacher, and (2) as they should be taught to a class".

Beyond this, I do not propose to suggest changes in the college teaching of Latin; there is no reason to fear even in our country and age that the necessity and importance of the sciences and their tech-



nological applications will overwhelm and blot out the demand for literary and historical insight; the Humanities still have a host of appreciative adherents, and Latin, properly taught, is not likely to be relegated to obscurity in our colleges.

The college courses of Latin must be freed from the intrusion of the mere mechanism of the language; students who are to seek inspiration from the pages of Horace, Tacitus and Lucretius must come to their task equipped for the larger atmosphere by their previous training.

Can the secondary school bring to the college portals such a type of students? Yes, if schools and teachers are prepared to take a definite stand on one or two general questions of secondary school organization. The fundamental note of the secondary school is opportunity, not compulsion; something highly desirable, but not necessary; we have no right, therefore, to render it ineffective by bringing its privileges down to the level of the unwilling, the incapable. If it is the ulterior aim of such opportunity to develop and foster initiative, intellectual and moral virility, then a process of diluted instruction, the administration of intellectual pabulum as to infants will not accomplish what is to be attained. A weak secondary school, weak in its aims and practice, weak in the qualifications and aspirations of its teachers, is less helpful to a community than a strong primary or grammar school. In the regenerative process that led up to its splendid school system of the nineteenth century, Prussia, as Paulsen points out, forced the abandonment of large numbers of debilitated secondary schools. We shall never make the teaching of any subject in our secondary curriculum valuable, unless we abandon the idea of soft transitions, of sugar-coated invitations to thinking. Vigor (I do not mean rigor) in teaching is a natural stimulus to efficiency, and this is the prime purpose of the secondary school to generate. Sluggishness, even though it veil itself in the guise of deliberation, is the unpardonable sin of the class room, deadening alike to the individual pupil and the class group. Training to rapidity, to quick recognition, is to-day demanded of every good primary teacher; why should the secondary teacher encourage a relapse? I need only remind you that President Eliot in his essay, *Education for Efficiency*, lays greatest stress on "imparting the habit of quick and concentrated attention".

We all admit that the Latin language can render its real service only if its formal elements be thoroughly mastered; to that end the first year's work should be entrusted to the teachers of the highest capacity. Instead of the prevalent scheme of assigning the initial work to those who have themselves frequently had no Latin beyond the secondary schools, and poor Latin at that, it should be made compulsory that the teacher of fourth year Latin

should also handle a first year class. Such an assignment would be as suggestive and instructive to him as it would be helpful to his pupils.

We cannot forego, that is admitted, the necessity of sharp drill, of insistence on *accuracy* and *rapidity*; we must lay stress on reviews; but didactic ability has discovered various means of making reviews more than a mere reiteration of previous efforts.

If we summarize the needs of our Latin classes in the one terse demand, that we require teachers who *can*, and who *will teach*, then certainly, in the first year's Latin work there should be no room for the mechanical teacher who simply repeats what he has seen others do, possibly at a time when he himself was a pupil. For, in every light, such work is barren. Study the efforts of the past, but *progress* beyond them; that is the first demand in the art and science of teaching.

Of the factors that will add to the value of the first year Latin, there may be enumerated these: with or without the aid of the text-book the teacher should discriminate between forms of common and of rare occurrence, insisting upon the former, and slighting temporarily the latter; grammar, to be effective, should present that which is actually necessary. The vocabulary acquired must be in constant use; it is absurd to introduce words, and then ignore them; without falling into dull and mechanical methods, we may employ a variety of tests in vocabulary; similarity in meaning, or contrast, may form the basis of one system of control, analogy in sound, another.

It is a prevalent error of the elementary books, due, I suppose, to the fancied exigencies of the Latin course, to confuse the beginner in Latin by introducing the fragments of syntactical information before paradigms have become even passably familiar. Nor is it wise to devote *excessive* attention to the matter of quantities; a teacher of sharp auditory powers, himself accurate in his pronunciation, and quick to detect and mend faulty pronunciation, reaches by the unconscious operation of the imitative tendency in his pupils adequate results. It is far more profitable to introduce as soon as possible simple Latin narrative with subject matter drawn from mythology, Roman history, Roman life; and there can be no objection to what is called 'made Latin', if only it be good Latin. If the pupils realized that instead of slavish adherence to a given text-book, the teacher was developing from language material in the pupils' possession subject matter to illustrate principles, and to strengthen previous acquisition of words and forms, if these exercises were carried out at first *orally* with the class, then, in *rapid* work at the blackboard, before any home exercises were imposed, if furthermore, the rule were adopted never to repeat in class blackboard exercises the identical task assigned for

home-work, but to confirm the principle that is under discussion by partial change of vocabulary, we should have substituted a keener interest for the deadly monotony of senseless repetition that is of little benefit to the weak pupil, and irritating to our bright pupils. It is not the difficulty of the subject that depresses our first year pupils, but lack of initiative, of inventiveness, in the instructor.

I contend that the art of teaching can easily secure its greatest triumph in this very field, and make the first year Latin a stirring and delightful exercise; but it rests solely with the teacher, his success depends on his knowledge and his ingenuity. Let him adopt suggestions from other fields of teaching, if they commend themselves by the evidence of their practical value. Why, for instance, have our beginners' books in Latin never applied the 'Anschauungsmethode', the method of furnishing through picture and illustration the material for language expression and thought, a method that has proved of great service in recent modern-language teaching? It would be a simple matter to develop systematically in pictorial forms a number of scenes that would suggest an extensive Latin vocabulary of concrete terms. It would need little more than a series of suggestions from our Latin scholars; of talented draughtsmen to embody them in appropriate illustrations we have no lack.

It is time that our teachers of the Classics abandon the absurd prejudice that still prevails in certain quarters against illustrative material as a legitimate aid to teaching; classes are crippled in their work, if not supplied with appropriate pictures, maps, charts; analogies, as well as differences, become more impressive through the process of visualization.

The preparation of the simple Latin narrative that has just been recommended as a desirable supplement to the study of forms will call for the introduction of much language material that our present primers sedulously avoid; they restrict themselves avowedly to the phraseology of Caesar, the first Latin author into whose work they aim to initiate these first year pupils by the shortest road they know of; the narrowing effect of this limitation is obvious.

And here we touch upon the most serious obstacle to the success of our secondary school Latin work; our present four-year course in Latin arranges a distribution of the work which militates directly against good results; it pretends to accomplish in a first year all the preparatory language work, and to devote the three successive years to the three authors, Caesar, Cicero and Vergil. It does nothing of the kind. With a meager and uncertain attainment in forms, and a still scantier knowledge of syntax, the pupils wrestle throughout the remaining years of the course with the elements of the lan-

guage that should have been acquired before the first attempt to interpret a literary masterpiece is undertaken; and, in the final tests that are to demonstrate their attainments, they are as deficient in these elementary acquirements as they have remained unfamiliar with the spiritual message of the authors they have been supposed to appreciate.

What our teachers should strive for, what college authorities should encourage, is a *deliberate advance*, in which quality, not quantity, is the end to be sought. Our teachers need the specific suggestion from the colleges that far more time should be devoted to preliminary training, two full years, or the greater part of two years; then let us read *two*, not four, books of Caesar, but read them properly, four orations of Cicero, three books of Vergil, varying from year to year in the choice of the books<sup>1</sup>. It is a simple matter to bind even disjointed selections together by the illuminating summaries that the teacher gives, and to single out passages of special significance from the view-point of content or of artistic quality; then we may hope to see aroused even in our secondary pupils a width of interest of which the subject is susceptible, but which at present is ignored; the teacher will then have time to dwell upon that relation between past and present that constitutes in my eyes the most vital justification of our Latin teaching. He may be interested in tracing the heritage of ancient modes of conduct, thought and expression as they reveal themselves in the literature of some modern language, or in the actual intellectual and institutional life of our day; he may be peculiarly responsive to the interplay of allusion, quotation, precedent; he may be curious to follow from the classical period downward the tentative advances in the domain of natural science, and may emphasize the growth of insight from error to truth. For such we need three things, time, rational teaching conditions, and suitably trained teachers. The Latin teacher does not stand alone in the demand for a more adequate time-allotment; like every other subject of the secondary school course, Latin needs to be relieved from the unwholesome present tendency toward congested acquisition; if the time is rapidly approaching when we shall secure a five or six-year high school course by the condensation of the elementary curriculum (a possibility now generally recognized and considered advisable for bright pupils), then it is all important that the gain in time shall not tempt us to a superficial scurrying over a larger tract, but shall make for genuine, thorough, inspiring work, a reasonable grasp of the structure of the Latin language, and a first glimpse of its literary and historic significance; it ought to diminish the present glaring

<sup>1</sup> This diminution of prescribed reading does not aim to reduce the quantity of Latin that is to be read; it will afford opportunity for a considerable quantity of *class-reading* at sight.

discrepancy between the printed requirements of our colleges and the attainment offered, and enable our students to meet honestly and safely the *present* demand! How beneficial to the moral tone of school and college the approach to such an ideal would be every serious teacher realizes.

Among the rational teaching conditions which are a second requirement I should designate first a larger view of the *economy* of teaching. Prosecute any method you please, but pursue it definitely through a period of time sufficiently extended to allow its results to appear. Frequent and imperfectly considered changes in system, in text-books, are only partially attributable to the unfortunate frequency of changes in teachers and administrators. No text-book, grammar or reader is so poor but that a competent teacher can utilize its better features, and minimize its shortcomings. Ignorance and corruptness favor constant change. Time economy requires, furthermore, a far more intimate co-ordination of the work from stage to stage; each teacher should take pride in controlling and recording in detail the knowledge his pupils have acquired, and assume the responsibility for definite advance; in perfecting this collaboration between the teachers of successive grades to a degree that we are entirely unconscious of lies much of the success of the German teachers. The teacher should realize that his is the artist's privilege to modulate, to change the rhythm, of his teaching; no prescription of superintendent or school board ought to be necessary to fix for an intelligent teacher the daily allotment of advance in his subject.

Do we not impair this free initiative of the thoughtful teacher by encouraging examinations through nearly three years of the student's secondary school life? We have in the past ridiculed England as being examination-ridden, but our present system of parcelling out fragments of acquired information, so much material furnished per term to the examination-hopper, is sapping the very foundations of rational teaching. When the same test may be undertaken in a given subject by second, third, or fourth year high school pupils, by the child of fifteen, and the young girl or man of eighteen, how can there be a definite standard of attainment, of exposition in and through language? The readers of entrance papers can tell us whether such a test is very far removed from degenerating into a farce. Strange that our examining authorities complicate rather than simplify the test; a searching inquiry into the most advanced requirements in each subject could compel proper organization of the elementary work in the schools. A Latin paper on Vergil and Cicero could easily be prepared that would test proficiency in simpler Latin, in the fundamentals of the language, the schools to stand or fall

by the aggregate of carefully adjusted work. Despite the approval of many secondary teachers whose motives are easily recognized, any ideal view of the function of the high school must repudiate a practice that reduces its teaching to preparation for an examination mill.

But in the last instances our hopes of improvement in the Latin work rest on the knowledge and training of our teachers. To be worth while as a subject of the secondary school, Latin must be taught superlatively well; none should teach it but those who have pursued its study throughout the greater part of their college course; the scholarship we need is not to be of that top-heavy type that has been engaged mainly in the refinements of philological enquiry; it is to embrace the larger perspective that comes to the conscientious student of the Classics from the cultural and historical viewpoint that has been previously advocated for our college courses in Latin. A recent English writer has aptly characterized the type of teacher that the secondary school needs, *the specialist of high general culture*; with the emphasis on the second part of the requirement, that is the type our Latin departments in the secondary schools need above all else. The specialization that narrows, that eyes with suspicion any living interest but one, that would separate and differentiate related topics, that would *denounce*, for instance, the teaching of Roman history by the Latinist because of possible infringement on the sphere of the historian, such specialization is detrimental to our schools. I thoroughly disbelieve in the doctrine that high-class capacity is only attainable by hiding from one's vision all other intellectual interests; I find that the *greatest* university teachers regard the special field they cultivate in its relation to the *larger* questions of life, and frequently obtain stimulus from remote and even unrelated fields of thought and activity.

The secondary teacher of Latin, if he aims to make his subject vital by emphasizing the nexus between past and present, will carry out naturally a valuable type of correlation; he correlates best who has acquired in his own growth the mental habit of correlation.

Teaching and teachers—in the union of greater skill with greater knowledge lies the prospect of establishing improved standards in the teaching of Latin.

JULIUS SACHS.

TEACHERS COLLEGE, Columbia University.

In THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 3.9 reference was made to a paper by Mr. Charles P. Steinmetz, a distinguished electrical engineer, connected with the General Electric Works at Schenectady, New York, and the promise was made that the paper would later



be presented in full. Mr. Steinmetz is a graduate of the University of Breslau. The paper follows:

#### ON THE VALUE OF THE CLASSICS IN ENGINEERING EDUCATION

The study of the Classics is very important and valuable, and more so in the education of the engineer than in most other professions, for the reason that the vocation of the engineer is especially liable to make the man one-sided. Since he deals exclusively with empirical science and its applications, the engineer forgets, or never realizes, that there are other branches of human thought equally important as factors of a broad general education and intellectual development. An introduction to these other fields is best and most quickly given by the study of the Classics, which open to the student worlds entirely different from our present (the world of Hellas and Art, of Rome and military administration), and so broaden his horizon most effectively, and show him values more in their proper proportion, undistorted by the trend of contemporary thought.

It is true that the Classics are not necessary if the aim is merely to fit the student to ply the trade of engineer, as one might ply the trade of plumber or boiler-maker; the world, and especially the United States, is full of men to whom engineering is but a trade. But such study of engineering can hardly be called receiving an education.

There also is a considerable utilitarian value in the classic languages, since the terminology of science is entirely based on Latin and Greek words and roots. It is difficult to memorize all the terms of science with which an educated man must be familiar, as those of medicine, botany, mineralogy, etc. This however becomes easy to the student of the classic languages, to whom these terms have a meaning.

The modern languages are not in the same class with the classic languages, as they open to the student no new world, no field of thought appreciably different from our own, and I therefore consider them of practically no educational value. Their utilitarian value to the college student is negligible, since, in consequence of the limited time, the absence of practice, and the large number of other more important subjects of study, very few college graduates retain even a rudimentary knowledge of modern languages; and even those few usually retain that knowledge just because they have occasion to practice them, and therefore would probably have learned them in any case outside of college. To the engineer particularly the knowledge of foreign modern languages offers no appreciable help in following the engineering progress of other countries, as practically all that is worth reading is translated into English either in full or in abstract; further, engineering publications written in a foreign language

are often closed to the reader, even if he has some knowledge of the language itself, by his lack of knowledge of the technical terminology of the foreign language.

Since the modern languages have no appreciable educational value, they should be dropped from the engineering curriculum of the college, as their retention violates the principle of the modern college curriculum, to restrict, by reason of the limited available time, the instruction to those subjects which the student can not acquire outside of the college by personal independent study, or can acquire thus only under great difficulties. Modern languages do not belong to this class; they are learned just as easily, if not more so, by independent study and conversation.

It may be noted, however, that the methods of teaching the Classics are not the most efficient, and, especially, the classic literature set before the student is not selected so as to offer the greatest educational value in broadening the student's view, and in attracting and retaining his interest as much as possible; the selection of authors to be read rather seems to be the result of survival from previous time.

Thus in Latin the story of war and conquest, of the victory of military organization over mere bravery recorded in Caesar's *De Bello Gallico*, is interesting and instructive, while the Civil War is of less interest. Even to-day Cicero's *De Officiis* is well worth reading, while the Orations against Catiline are stupefying to the intellect, since any intelligent boy must ask why did the 'man afraid of his shadow' not have Catiline arrested and executed for high treason. In Latin poetry selections from Ovid's *Metamorphoses* are very easy reading, and are a valuable introduction to the classic meter, and interesting in the parallelism of the myths of the classic world with those of other races (the flood, etc.). It is hard to understand the retention in the curriculum of the uninteresting plagiarism of the courtier Vergil, while Horace, the poet at once most interesting and of the greatest educational value, is not read at all in most college curricula. Of all Roman writers, Horace probably exerts the most broadening influence on the intellect when read under an intelligent instructor; the change from the distorted importance in which persons and things appear to their contemporaries to the proper proportion in the perspective of history probably is nowhere so sharply demonstrated as in the relation between the *libertino patre natus* and his 'protector' and 'patron' Maecenas, whose name has escaped oblivion merely by his protegee's favor. The reading of Horace probably is the best remedy for discouragement resulting from lack of appreciation of one's efforts. Further, the American, in particular, who is generally liable to take himself too seriously,

might benefit from the sentiment of certain of the Odes. In short, almost every poem of Horace is interesting and instructive and conveys a moral to which we may well give ear.

In Greek prose, Xenophon's *Anabasis* is interesting and instructive in many respects, and may well be followed by the student with maps of the country traversed by the ten thousand. Selections from Lucian possibly are the nearest approach to Horace in their broadening influence. The Greek drama probably is beyond the scope of reading which can be attempted in a general college course, and also appears to me less important now, since in the modern northern drama we have similar tendencies exhibited. The easy dialect of the *koiné* however is within the reach of the student, and at least a part of the New Testament may be read in the original. The greatest work of the literature of Hellas however is Homer; and here again in many American schools the *Iliad* only is read, possibly from the mistaken notion that it is easier reading, while the far more interesting *Odyssey* is slighted, though the latter with its tales of travel and adventures with giants and monsters, should especially appeal to the American boy, and is of far greater interest and educational value in its minute description of every day life at the early dawn of human history, and in its pictorial representations of divers occupations.

#### REVIEWS

A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek, according to the Septuagint. By Henry St. John Thackeray. Vol. I. Cambridge University Press (G. P. Putnam's Sons: New York): 1909. Pp. xx+325.

There is hardly any subject in which a teacher needs to rewrite his lectures oftener than in the Greek Testament. It is not quite safe to go before one's class without reading the morning paper. Even the least learned of periodicals is not to be lightly passed by; it may contain a photographic facsimile of a newly found piece of papyrus from the Egyptian rubbish heaps of the last century before, or the first century after, the Christian era. Such a document may contain one well-attested instance of the use of a peculiar Greek form by some merchant making out a bill, or may show some school boy, innocent of grammar and spelling, writing a letter home which will upset the learned theories of generations of scholars.

Some years ago we started on our study of Biblical Greek with a considerable list of Hebraisms which we have been gradually cutting off at both ends until precious little is left. We begin to say "so-called Hebraisms" or even "falsely so-called Hebraisms". Speaking of the labors of J. H. Moulton in this field, Thackeray says: "Anything which has ever been termed a Hebraism rouses his suspicion".

The term Biblical Greek is scarcely allowed, nor must we speak of the late Greek, the *Koiné*, as "vulgar" or "corrupt". Some things in classical Greek died, but they died as a seed dies to clear the way for the growth of a germ of new life hidden within.

We must differentiate between the Greek of the Septuagint and that of the New Testament, for the former is in large part a translation, not only literal but servile, from a language of alien type; while the latter is free composition in the colloquial, vernacular Greek of the people. The N. T. writers, like King James's translators, aimed to use a language "understood of the people".

The Jews of this period were a bilingual people: they used both Aramaic and Greek, with a little sprinkling of Latin in words introduced by Roman domination, e. g. names of coins and military officers. We still speak of a legion and a centurion.

But Greek was the conqueror of its conquerors, as Horace said, and held its own against foreign influences with characteristic vitality, and, above all other languages, has resisted the gnawing tooth of time.

Yet there is no blinking the fact that a great strain was put upon it in the use for which the Biblical writers and translators employed it. A translation-language is apt to be more or less warped in the process. Moreover, the expression of a whole range of new religious ideas foreign to Greek thought, while not affecting forms and syntax, produced a great change in the connotation of common Greek words. A word is more or less of a cup and holds what is put into it. In this sense there is a Biblical Greek. As Swete says in his Introduction to the Septuagint, "The manner of the LXX is not Greek". What idea would Thucydides, or even Aristotle have received from such a sentence as e. g. Mark 1:4 "John, the baptizer, came in the wilderness preaching baptism of repentance for remission of sins"? And yet nearly every word (except *βαπτισμα*) is a classical word in good and regular standing. As one of the old writers said: "It is a Greek body with a Hebrew soul".

These matters, however, are lexical, and the book before us is grammatical.

Thackeray's Grammar of the Septuagint covers a field hitherto almost unoccupied, though Swete's Introduction had given a condensed summary and the introduction to Conybeare and Stock's Selections from the Septuagint contains a clear and well-arranged statement of essentials of grammatical peculiarities.

The study of the Septuagint has come to its own, not only as a help to the study of the N. T., but also as representing an important period in the history of the Greek language in general. As was said by Kennedy in his Sources of New Testament Greek, "Every stage of a language is of paramount



importance for the history of the whole". As J. H. Moulton says in his epoch-making *Prolegomena*, "What has happened to our own particular study is only the discovery of its unity with the larger science which has been maturing steadily all the time. Biblical Greek was long supposed to be in a backwater; it has now been brought out into the full stream of progress".

The linguistic value of the Septuagint is heightened by the fact that it extends over about three centuries of time and exemplifies both vernacular and literary phases of the *κοινή*. Moreover, it affords a bridge, and sometimes the only bridge, between classical usage and Byzantine and modern Greek. The line of development thus becomes clear and unbroken.

The colloquial tendency at work in Greek as in all languages has been resisted at every step by the conservative literary tendency of writers who make correctness according to classical standards a conscious aim. The struggle is still going on in the schools and newspapers of Athens. So religious conservatism must have influenced the language of the Septuagint.

A scholarly treatment of the grammar of the group of writings comprised in the Greek O. T. has been a desideratum, and the present volume meets a real want. It is confined to Introduction, Orthography and Accidence and leaves us eager for the volume on syntax.

The author recognizes the complex nature of the language of the LXX, as made up largely of the *κοινή* element, but not disregarding the Semitic element. Without entering into minute detail, the book is not only scholarly in material and method, but clear in presentation and arrangement, and in the well-known fine typography of the Cambridge University Press. The Table of Verbs, and indeed the whole treatment of the verb-forms is a model of accuracy and clearness.

WELLESLEY COLLEGE.

ANGIE CLARA CHAPIN.

#### A Short Grammar of the Greek New Testament.

By A. T. Robertson. New York: A. C. Armstrong and Son (1909). Pp. xxix+240.

Professor Robertson's N. T. Grammar starts from practically the same point of view as Mr. Thackeray in the book just reviewed; it explains in detail recent researches into the character of the *κοινή* and Hellenistic Greek, and especially emphasizes as he says, "the main point . . . that the N. T. is written in the vernacular Greek of the time".

The book is planned for those who already know more or less of classical Greek. This is well, for the N. T. is no proper field for a novice.

The author seems to presuppose not only a knowledge of Greek but also of classes of manuscripts as 'Western', 'Neutral', etc., also the symbols of manuscripts, 'Aleph', 'B'.

Part I is Introduction. Part II takes up the study of forms and Part III syntax. There is a systematic effort to trace the history both of forms and syntax by reference to Sanskrit and to various Greek dialects, as well as to modern Greek. Less recognition is given to the LXX than might be expected in a historical treatment.

There is no continuous numbering of sections throughout the book, which would have made reference easier. Burton's Moods and Tenses, for example, shows the advantage of such numbering. The average student is not willing to wade through a solid page or two for the sake of finding the one small point which meets his difficulty.

The Greek is printed with remarkable accuracy, and the same should be said of the references to passages, a large number of which I have verified. As the old saying is: "Trifles make up perfection, but perfection is no trifle". There is evidence on every page of thorough, conscientious study not only of the N. T. itself but of the best books on the subject (witness the Bibliography).

It is sure to be a useful treatise, and will help to put N. T. study on a sound and scholarly basis. Most of the N. T. grammars heretofore published in this country have been either too elementary or too cumbersome, but exception should be made in favor of Professor Burton's book mentioned above, to which all N. T. students and teachers are indebted.

While giving cordial praise to Professor Robertson's work, I hope it may not seem ungracious to point out a few matters of which I have made note. One of the most valuable chapters is that on Principal Parts of some important Verbs. The list does not profess to be complete but might well have included the new presents *γρηγορέω*, *κρύβω*, *λιμπάνω* (rare), *νίπτω*, *όπτάνω* (-ομαι), *χύνω*. Under *ἤκω* the reference to Mk. 8.3 should come in the next line, after "*ἤκουσιν*", and *ἤκα* would then be unnecessary.

Somewhere mention ought to be made of *ἰδοὺ* already with this accent used as an interjection in Attic (perhaps p. 14. e.).

On p. 26.2 (f) repeats (b), and (g) repeats (e). On page 27 one looks in vain for *πρῶτός μου*, Jo. 1.15. On p. 35, at the close of (a), which speaks of three aorists in -κα, add: "and does not restrict their use to the singular number". P. 36, 1.7, is probably intended to read "The ν class (nasal class) comprises verbs inflected like both of the previous classes", i. e. both ω-verbs and μ-verbs. In connection with 39, l. 10 (see also p. 144, 3rd line from bottom) it should be noted that this combination of *ἔχω* with Aor. participle is not found in the N. T.

In the middle of p. 39 the statement that in the N. T. "*οἶδα* is conjugated regularly in singular and plural of the indicative" is misleading, especially as

it is followed by reference to *τασιν* in Acts 26:4, which to the mind of the classical student is regular. On p. 40, top, the whole subject of analytic (periphrastic) verb-forms which are so characteristic of N. T. Greek might well have been treated with more fulness. Simcox in his *Language of the New Testament* has done good service here. The usage in Attic prose is well exhibited in an article in A. J. P. 4. 291, which does away with the fashion of calling these forms 'Aramaic' since in Plato alone there are over two hundred examples. Dr. W. G. Ruthenford in *Cl. Rev.* for 1903 speaks of this as "A neglected Idiom". The participle, by the way, in this construction is attributive and not supplementary as stated on p. 195.7.

Another important matter which seems to be inadequately treated in all the grammars, is the middle voice (it lies outside Burton's province).

A correct and idiomatic use of the middle voice is a delicate test of an author's style and feeling. Simcox well says (op. cit.) "So far as the middle voice shows signs of decay (in the N. T.), it is that it is disused, not used incorrectly". The N. T. writers show a good range of use of the middle, 'indirect' and 'subjective' as well as reflexive ('direct'), which last is overlooked by many of the authorities. See e. g. Mk. 14.54 *θερμαινόμενος*, of Peter warming himself).

For a study of the enormously enlarged function of *τα* in this later language, we shall still need to refer our students to Burton. The remark in Robertson p. 132 that "Instead of the imperative we sometimes have *τα* (Eph. 5.33)" and the citation of Mk. 5.23 on p. 154.5, remind me to mention a most illuminating article by A. N. Janaris in the *Expositor*, Series V, Vol. IX, p. 296, in which he traces the history of this colloquial form equivalent to the jussive infinitive, down to the modern Greek polite command with *να* and the subjunctive. That no ellipsis was felt in this construction, any more than in the similar Attic idiom of *δως* with the future (see G. M. T. 271) seems the rational explanation.

But enough! Save to say in closing that the chapter on indirect discourse is particularly good, and that I gladly welcome every help toward the intelligent study of the Greek of the Bible.

WELLESLEY COLLEGE.

ANGIE CLARA CHAPIN.

*Society and Politics in Ancient Rome.* By Frank Frost Abbott. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons (1909).

The selection of a title for a book is often a difficult task. This is particularly true when the book is a compilation of papers, the subjects of which may barely admit of the same classification but are brought together conveniently in one volume, having already served as magazine articles

at an earlier date. Under these circumstances the title often suggests what is not contained in the book, and, on the other hand, does not indicate the contents with sufficient exactness. Both of these facts are true of the interesting book which we are considering. The title, *Society and Politics in Ancient Rome*, leads the student to expect an elaborate work on this important subject, and the reader will certainly be disappointed when he discovers the form and character of the book. Of the twelve articles, four deal directly with political questions, six may be classed as referring to Roman society and are the fruit of the author's studies in palaeography and epigraphy. Two of the papers, entitled *Literature and the Common People of Rome* and *Roman Women in the Trades and Professions*, are published for the first time.

There are two characteristics which are common to all these papers. The author has endeavored, and with considerable success, to draw a parallel between conditions in ancient Rome and in the society of our own day. This is the most striking feature of his article entitled *The Story of Two Oligarchies*. It is undoubtedly true that this plan of making clear the customs of earlier days by referring to those of the present day is exceedingly helpful and enlightening. It renders a book attractive to the general reader.

The second characteristic is the popular method of treating subjects which are generally handled in an abstruse and wearisome way. Professor Abbott's style is most attractive, and while he impresses us with his scholarship he does not oppress us with so much learning as to make the book wearisome. The truth of this statement is fully maintained by the character of the reviews of this book which have appeared in magazines devoted to general topics. Such works are of value as arousing in the student an interest in classical literature and in archaeology. For this reason the debt of classical archaeology to such a writer as Lanciani is exceedingly great.

There are several matters which are deserving of correction and to which attention should be called. On page 5 the author has quoted an inscription giving a reference to Henzen—which, by the way, would be clearer as Orelli-Henzen—6977. The form of the inscription is not that found in Orelli-Henzen, but has evidently been taken from the introduction to C. I. L. IV, where the reading of Reinsius is given. On page 214 the author refers to "an official inscription lately found at Aquinum" which is dedicated to the younger Cicero. This inscription is a *falsa*, and is so classified in C. I. L. X \*704. It was given in the old collection by Mommsen of Neapolitan Inscriptions but was starred when transferred to Volume X of the Corpus. It has also been quoted by the writer of the article *nomen* in

Smith's Dictionary of Classical Antiquities, the editor of which evidently regarded it as valid. On page 206 the numeral of the footnote is misplaced. In the paper entitled *The Evolution of the Letters of our Alphabet* Professor Abbott applies very skillfully the theory of evolution to the development of letters. This scientific theory can undoubtedly be applied to certain questions of interest in classical archaeology, particularly to the development of letters in the study of palaeography. Unfortunately, however, Professor Abbott is wrong in his reference to the form of the letter Q. He declares that "The form which we find in the earliest Latin inscriptions is a circle, or an oval approaching very closely to a circle, with a tangential affix drawn horizontally to the right from the bottom of the circle". Later on, he declares that "out of a variant developed a form in which the pendant was drawn downward". The form with a downward pendant is in fact the original and is the form found in the earliest Latin inscriptions, as seen in the Duenos inscription in the Forum Inscription, and in the first inscription in Ritschl's P. L. M. E. It is the form of the Greek prototype. It is, therefore, inexact to say that the form with the tangential affix to the right is that found in the earliest Latin inscriptions.

There are a number of other statements which follow in this paper which do not produce full confidence as to their correctness, and although Professor Abbott's theory is undoubtedly sound, yet it can hardly be said that he maintains it successfully in his treatment of the letter Q.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

JAMES C. EGBERT.

Costume in Roman Comedy. By Catherine Saunders. New York: The Columbia University Press (1909). Pp. 145. \$1.25.

This volume appearing in the comely dress of the Columbia University Series of Studies in Classical Philology bears, by editorial preface, the special commendation of Professor Peck's *imprimatur*.

Under the captions of Sources, Terminology, Prologus, Stock-roles, and Unusual Roles the author presents in methodical discussion the chief evidence, literary and artistic, for the conventions of Roman comic costume, and has contributed essentially to the interesting subject of Roman scenic antiquities. The literary sources are professedly the plays of Plautus and Terence, Euanthius, Donatus, Pollux and "scattered references mainly from Roman literature", with which has been coordinated the artistic evidence of the illustrated manuscripts of Terence, Pompeian wall-paintings, Campanian reliefs, statuettes and Roman terra-cottas. In the use of the illustrated manuscripts and of the comedians themselves for the purpose in hand, Dr. Saunders

has found her chief task and one essentially new, though Van Wageningen's chapter *De histrionis vestitu* (Scaenica Romana, 1907), of which I find no mention, anticipated, in intent at least, the work upon the miniatures. Since the estimate of the scenic values of these must vary with the opinion of their origin and the age represented by them, critical consideration is given to the theories involved, to which is appended the conclusion from the present study, "that the artist of the archetype was really attempting to represent Greek costumes, such as were worn in *fabulae palliatae*, but that either he did not understand the simplest principles of Greek dress or his illustrations have been copied by persons who were decidedly ignorant of those principles" (p. 13). The discussion of the date of this archetype does not advance beyond the *pros* and *cons* of the question to the expression of a positive opinion. Though it is thought that the "signs of ignorance" present in all of the four principal manuscripts may discredit the theory of a "very early" date for the original, due allowance is made for the supposition of an ancient original which has been blunderingly transmitted. Unless it be shown that these signs are, in given cases, *common* to all the manuscripts concerned, there seems little reason to extend the blame for these faults to an "original artist". On the other hand, by assuming an original *factor* contemporaneous with the known period of stage presentations, and ignorant *librarii* of the dates of the miniatures themselves, the main characteristics of the pictures can in great measure be satisfactorily explained. While therefore the study does not seem to justify the claim of Professor Peck's prefatory appreciation that "it goes far in itself to disprove the extravagant beliefs once held in their (i. e. the miniature's) antiquity", it has amply demonstrated by scholarly analysis their many inconsistencies and lack of coherent testimony. There is insufficient recognition of the special inferiority of O for the discussion of costume, yet Dr. Saunders has used the pictures, so far as accessible in reliable reproductions, with great skill and insight into the significance of the crude attempts at portraiture. It remains perhaps to be regretted that it has been impossible to follow an altogether comparative method of investigation by which more positive evidence might have been possible for the authority of the supposed scenic tradition.

The discussion of terminology involves consideration of *choregus*, *ornamenta*, *choragium*, *ornatus*, *ornare*, *exornare*, *vestimentum*, *vestis*, and *vestitus*, and reaches (p. 26) a pitfall in the categorical statement that "*vestimentum* occurs but once in Terence, in Haut. 141". Verse 903 of the same play shows the word, relieved of formulaic strictures.

Errors in type are *Cappadox* for *Cappadox* (p. 63), *pedisegui* for *pedisequi* (p. 123), *Cleareta* for



*Cleastera* (p. 61), *Palaestrio* for *Palaestrio* (p. 115) and the omission of a colon after *excepto* (p. 76).

The seemingly exhaustive citation of the testimony of Plautus and Terence leaves opportunity to wonder that certain references were omitted, yet the evidence of careful compilation leads to the impression that such were disregarded rather than overlooked. Other pertinent matter might have been cited from the scholia of the minor source, Donatus, and the barrenness of categories relieved by the introduction of more illustrative material from the general literature. The writer has, however, achieved her essential aims with laudable thoroughness and given by dependable method a useful compendium of interesting information.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY.

JOHN W. BASORE.

The *Trinummus* of Plautus. Edited with Introduction and Notes, by H. R. Fairclough. New York: The MacMillan Company. (1909.) Pp. xxxiv+118. 60 cents net.

This is a compact edition with brief notes, on the same plan as the earlier volumes in the series appearing under the direction of Professor J. C. Egbert. The text is in substantial agreement with that of Leo (1896) and that of Lindsay (1903). A few other readings adopted may be mentioned: *face*, 174; *vestipica*, 251; *opperiam*, 391; *satillum*, 492; *hac*, 857.

An introduction of some length deals with the Life and Works of Plautus; Prosody; Meter; and the Plot of the *Trinummus*. An interesting feature is an analysis of the *Canticum*, vss. 223-300, based on Leo's *Plautinische Cantica und die Hellenistische Lyrik* (1897)—the first instance of the sort, as far as I know, in any edition in English.

It is cause for some surprise that the language of Plautus is not discussed in this introduction; its archaisms in forms and syntax, and its wavering and unstable character are not even alluded to here. If it is in harmony with the general plan of brevity in the series to devote fourteen pages to minutiae of prosody and meter, it surely would have been consistent—and an economic use of space as well—to devote at least half that number of pages to an outline sketch of the chief linguistic peculiarities, such as Professor Fairclough has included in his edition of the *Andria* of Terence (pp. lxxi-lxxxii). As it is, the Notes are continually stating classical equivalents for the archaic forms, with rarely a hint or explanation of the real relation of the two, and with no attempt to group such peculiarities under any broad classifications of phonetic development. This is an omission that most teachers will regret. A brevity that demands the omission of such a sketch should also have excluded the sketch given of meter and prosody.

The Notes are relatively generous, covering about

as many pages as the text itself; they show the influence of Brix's edition. There is a considerable repetition of statements on archaic forms, as just remarked. The notes on forms constitute the weakest and most disappointing feature of the whole book. They are frequently so worded as to be not easily understood, or even misleading; sometimes they omit such saving qualifications as 'usually' or 'generally', or are even questionable in point of fact. The following quotations from the Notes will show some of these inadvertences, and some other matters worthy of notice.

37. "*odiosae*: archaic for *odiosae* through an intermediate *odionsus*". *Odionsus* is of course first in the series, not second.

60. "*faxo* (*fac-so*) is really an aorist subjunctive with future force". This is better than the common statement that such forms are future perfect. Another explanation is that such forms are futures, out and out; what Sommer says in his *Handbuch* (pp. 624, 625) approximates closely to this.

86. "The passive infinitive in *-ier* is used by Plautus only at the end of a line." As a matter of fact, it occurs medially in *Mil.* 1073, *Cas.* 220, 723 (all anapaestic); and in *Men.* 1006 and *Poen.* 742 (both iambic).

108. The comment on the measurement of *eius* is misleading. A very careful statement is that in the revised Lane, 133 (2).

112. "*ipsus*=*ipse*, the latter being a weakened form". This is little less than astounding. "Die nominale Endung [*ipso*s, *ipsus*] scheint . . . alt zu sein, ohne dass ein Grund für diese Eigentümlichkeit aufzufinden wäre" (Sommer, p. 460). Even clearer is the statement of Lindsay (*Lat. Lang.*, p. 441).

176. The unique syntax of this verse is passed over without mention.

297. This verse is called (p. xxx) an anapaestic dimeter, and the editor, following Leo's note, says that "*uiuito*, a cretic word . . . which is perhaps pronounced as a dissyllable". This seems more than doubtful; cf. Lindsay, *Captivi*, editio maior, p. 22. This verse is called a cretic tetrameter catalectic in the small Götz-Schöll edition (v. 295 in their numbering).

324. "*autumo* is a lengthened form of *aio*". So says the Harper Lexicon of 1879, to be sure. The attractive etymology of Wharton (*auti-tumo*, cf. *ἄφ' ο*), accepted by Lindsay (*Lat. Lang.* pp. 180, 235), is rejected by Walde (p. 58); but whether *autumo* comes from *autem* (so Zimmermann, with Walde's approval) or not, to derive it from *aio* is certainly not to be thought of.

436. "*duint* — used only at the end of a verse". Yet *perduit* (*Poen.* 740, iambic), *duint* (*Pseud.* 937, anapaestic), and *perduit* (*Men.* 451, trochaic) all occur medially.

532. "*fieri* at the end of a verse; otherwise *fieri*". Yet Am. 567 (bacchiac), and Poen. 1056 (iambic senarius) show *fieri* medially. The instance in Poen. 1056 cannot be explained as occurring at a colon end of the type discovered by Jacobsohn (1904).

591. The note is meaningless until we realize that a semi-colon inserted between *impetraui* and *abiret* (top of p. 86) will restore sense by marking off clearly the paratactic stage; but even with correct punctuation the note seems too brief to be understood by the student.

826. "*Contra* is always an adverb in Plautus". Generally, but not always; *contra* is a preposition twice in Persa 13, and a third instance is found in Pseud. 156.

939. "*isti=iuisti*". It seems a pity to resurrect this old error. See Lane, 767.

1126. "*quoi*: a peculiar genitive form (= *quouis*, reduced to *quois*, *quoi*". This is the suggestion given in Sommer (1902); but Sommer himself calls this explanation "*möglich — — vielleicht*" (p. 471). The older explanation (see Lindsay, Lat. Lang., p. 431) still seems to have its value.

1136. "*hoc*: this subject". It seems likely that *hoc commodum* is an adverbial phrase, like *nunc ipsum*, Bacchides 940 and Cic. Att. 10.4.10. Cf. 'the noo'='now'.

The notes contain some interesting and apt citations of parallel passages from Shakspeare, Tennyson, and others, that have escaped previous editors.

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY.

ARTHUR W. HODGMAN.

On March 7 Professor J. S. Reid, of Cambridge University, England, gave his first lecture on The Place of the Municipality in Ancient Civilization, and particularly in that of the Roman Empire (see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY, 3.151).

The town, said Professor Reid, was the chief constituent of the Roman Empire. The Empire itself had its source in a small town. No development in the history of the human race is so stupendous as this—that a tiny city should bring within its power all the elements of ancient culture, whether Greek or Oriental, and besides all the Western barbarians who had been wholly untouched by Greek or Oriental influences. Roman history is municipal rather than imperial. Ancient historians, as Livy and Tacitus, are pre-eminently interested in town life at Rome; they deal with other matters only in connection with this; Rome the town is constantly in the foreground; glimpses of other parts of the Empire are few and transient.

Through the excavations and inscriptions our knowledge of the Roman Empire has been completely transformed. The mass of information, however, entails some loss—the field is now so vast that there is little hope of a new Gibbon to illuminate the whole.

We tend to look upon the Empire as a collection of provinces, mainly determined by nationalities, but the Romans in the time of Augustus had quite a different view. They regarded it as a collection of municipalities. These conformed to a general type,

but there was a distinct line of demarcation between the Hellenized East and the Romanized West, resulting in profound differences of administration, until finally the separation between the Eastern and the Western Empires resulted.

Professor Reid proposes to deal mainly with Italianized towns in Western lands in the Roman period; and in the main with their historical aspects and their influence on the Roman Empire.

The ancients made a sharp distinction between city and village communities. A normal city must have either complete autonomy or a considerable measure of it; it always (at any rate at first) had a ring of fortifications round it; it possessed territory outside this; it had a council, magistrates, citizen assembly; its own gods, and priests to serve them. A city that had lost its autonomy was regarded as dead; Capua, punished for its support of Hannibal, was still the second city of Italy in population and trade, but was looked on as politically dead until restored to civic rights by Julius Caesar.

Local patriotism was a great force, as we see from the inscriptions. The Romans, perhaps the greatest political opportunists the world has ever seen, utilized this force; they followed the line of least resistance in their dealing with the subject races. They tolerated local diversities, and seldom put down even cruel local cults, nor did they ever attempt to stamp out the local language. Before Diocletian there were few general enactments made for the whole Empire; even in law many local peculiarities were allowed to exist; the growth of uniformity was due largely to pressure from below. The great example of this is the refusal of Rome to give citizenship to the Italian allies until compelled to do so in 90 B. C. by the Social War—one of the most momentous struggles in the history of civilization. The victory of the allies decided that Roman law, language, and institutions should spread over the whole West. The unification of Italy was the first step.

Rome is the only city in history that has ever been able to build up a lasting imperial power, and the reason of her success was the leaving of autonomy to the towns.

BARNARD COLLEGE.

G. M. HIRST.

In his second lecture Professor Reid began by pointing out that the influence of Rome in the Italian peninsula was spread by the creation of new municipalities. By the time of the Hannibalic War there was a confederation of perhaps 130 or 140 cities, in which Rome was the predominant partner. As Rome's power grew, she gradually amalgamated the cities into her empire, but the conditions imposed were usually very moderate—a great contrast to Greek States. The three main conditions were:

(1) Peace. The smaller states were not allowed to fight among themselves; the Pax Romana was a matter of policy.

(2) Rome represented the subject communities to the outside world, i. e. controlled their foreign policy.

(3) She expected aid from them in war. Apart from this the cities had a large measure of freedom.

It was not until the Hannibalic War that a breach was made in this policy. Then a new kind of Roman arose—instead of Fabius Cunctator there is Marcellus, who plundered Syracuse of its works of art, and practised cruelty towards the population of Sicily. The hand of Rome became heavy on her

allies, and the result was the Social War.

In the early days there was a gradual expansion of the municipal territory of Rome. Ancient Italian custom allowed the conqueror to take one-third of the conquered city's territory. When Rome did this, she settled citizens on the new territory, and new 'tribes' were formed; but this expansion ceased in B. C. 241, at the end of the First Punic War. From this time the *Ager Romanus* consisted of 35 tribes, in which Roman citizens dwelt.

Another method of expansion was by colonies, which at first were really frontier posts of defence. After 338 only Latins were sent to these colonies, not Roman citizens. The Roman colonies that were sent out were almost all on the coast. The Senate was anti-expansionist, and opposed Flaminius in his efforts to found colonies in North Italy. The only two he actually founded were Placentia and Cremona. After the Hannibalic War numbers of old soldiers had to be provided for, and the idea of a colony as an economic provision arose. Rome began to treat her allies more harshly, and as a result they began to desire to give up their own institutions for the Roman franchise. C. Gracchus was the first to take up the cause of the Italians, and make it a burning question at Rome. But it took 30 or 40 years of devastating war to settle it. The process of unification after the Social War is obscure, but an assimilation between municipal institutions at Rome and those of the smaller towns had been going on for centuries. This process makes it difficult to tell whether the various parts of Roman government are characteristically Roman or rather Italian. The most striking characteristic of Roman government is its system of checks and counter-checks, and the most striking representative of this principle is the tribune. As a tribune is very rarely found in other cities, it looks as if the counter-check system were really a Roman institution.

In the wretched period after the Social War the municipalities suffered greatly, especially from Sulla, who took their land and settled his veterans upon it in colonies, often close beside the old city. C. Gracchus had treated the colony under two aspects:

(1) Frankly economic, to provide for distress.

(2) Extra-Italian civilization. He wished to re-settle Carthage, and did send settlers there, but the Senate was bitterly opposed to him, and did not allow these colonists full civic rights. However, soon after his death, Narbonne was founded in 118 as a rival to Massilia. Julius Caesar gave democratic institutions to Carthage, planned to settle Corinth, and gave back civic rights to Capua—three great commercial cities crushed by Rome. He carried Italy to the Alps—from this time there is a sharp distinction between *Italian* and *foreign* soil.

BARNARD COLLEGE.

G. M. HIRST.

### CORRESPONDENCE

Ever since receiving your issue of February 12 I have had it in mind to write you regarding the list of 600 words for first year Latin, and the theory on which this list is advocated. It touches a subject on which, lo, these many years, I have been hoping that somebody would do something.

While I was at Harvard, though I was supposed to have a pretty good vocabulary, I learned, by the expenditure of considerable effort, a whole vocabulary of commonly used words, containing over 2000 words, learning them in such a way that I could 'quiz' myself by placing a card over the meanings and drawing it down the page as I proceeded, to see

whether the meaning as I remembered it was the correct one, and marking the words I missed each time, and going over and over it until I could give the Latin word for every English equivalent without a single error. I never did anything that helped me more in Latin composition, and I have often wondered why this plan was not generally used. It seems to be thought in these latter days that the study of the ancient languages must be 'made easy', but one cannot get away from certain lines of hard and persistent effort. And the effort required to memorize a large vocabulary, entirely without association with context, is considerable, but the results obtained are worth all the effort, for the very fact that the words are in the mind entirely separated from any context makes the facility with which one can recall them for use far more valuable.

Another thing that seems of great importance is the learning of the primary, or fundamental, meanings of the words in this way. To my mind the greatest possible mistake in the work of beginners, in connection with the acquiring of a vocabulary, is the almost universal failure to learn the primary meanings, necessitating the repeated looking up of the very same word to pick out the appropriate secondary, or even tertiary, meaning that will 'fit the place'. This habit, a fatal one, to my mind, has been tremendously fostered by the ever-increasing use of special vocabularies, which are, I believe, a delusion and a snare of the worst kind, for many reasons.

The accurate knowledge of the primary meaning of a word that has many meanings enables one to work out for himself, with constantly increasing facility, (and it soon becomes far more than a guess and affords the most valuable kind of mental training) almost any meaning the word may have.

Accordingly I was greatly pleased to find that this phase of the teaching of Latin is now receiving so much thought and attention, and the article of Mr. Hurlbut, accompanying this list of 600 words, ought to be productive of much good. One of the most important facts connected with the thorough and accurate learning of the primary meanings is the *enormous* saving of labor that is thereby affected.<sup>1</sup>

EDWARD W. HAWLEY.

This letter is not an essay to be added to the collection stored up in the volumes of the editors' study. It is rather a means of giving vent to my personal feelings in behalf of the Maid of Antium, now abominably scandalized in the gossip of Rome. Doubtless you well know how in 1878 a tempest brought the maiden a second time into this unsympathetic world in a spot belonging to Nero's Antian Villa. Although she might in that year have been picked up for a mere trifle in ready cash, she grew rapidly in repute of loveliness and in money value, till last autumn the government, to rescue her from the all-devouring foreign art-shark, felt compelled to pay for her a sum nearly equivalent to ninety thousand dollars. Among the opinions then expressed as to her connections some said she was of the school of Lysippus; and when early in December the King paid her the compliment of an afternoon call in the corridors of the Terme, a courtly art-critic had the honor of informing his Majesty

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Hawley's letter is especially valuable because he is not a teacher but a busy lawyer of Minneapolis, who still has an interest in the Classics. For some Latin verses by him, see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 1.59. C. K.



that she was, or well might be, a daughter of the great Praxiteles. This was the pinnacle of her glory. Scarcely a week elapsed when a member of the parliamentary opposition, criticising the government act of purchase, asserted on the floor of the House that she was no earlier than the principate of Nero, chiseled at the command of the tyrant, by no respectable artist, but by a common, every-day mechanic. His remarks were greeted with roars of mirthful applause. Alas that her sweetness had to be embittered by the gall and wormwood of politics! But worse things were yet to come. Quite recently Mrs. Strong of the British School, at least as gossip affirms, has pronounced IT of Antium to be, not a girl, but a boy! How vexed must the demure maiden feel to have her gender as well as her artistic worth so suddenly and capriciously altered! The strange, perverted notion that the statue represented a boy was offered some weeks earlier by a writer in a well known Italian periodical. The criteria of these persons, however, are subjective. Anyone who walks through the Vatican and the Terme will say that there are Minervas, Muses, and Nymphs more masculine than the dear one of Antium. Most likely she is a prophetess of the Lycian Apollo (cf. Altmann, in *Jahresh. d. österr. Arch. Inst. in Wien* 6 (1903), pp. 180 ff.), the god's maiden bride, chosen to this calling for her chaste modesty. She is neither a youthful Hera nor a youthful Aphrodite, and her physique lacks therefore the characteristic features of these woman types. Perhaps, too, the sculptor slightly assimilated her form to that of her divine husband. This view will explain her somewhat boyish make-up without wounding her self-respect. But the reviling mob will not be satisfied with such explanations. Every day it swells in numbers and in virulence of speech. I wish I could join with the revilers, for scoffing in such an evident mark of independent judgment and good taste. But I am incapable. I can only wait and worship in secret silence, known only to you and me, till the pendulum swings my way. I think of her now, and always shall, as a sweet, charming maiden, not indeed the work of Praxiteles or of Lysippus, but perhaps of some early Hellenistic sculptor, who was certainly profoundly original and possessed an absolute mastery of his art.

Rome, March 5, 1910.

GEORGE WILLIS BOTSFORD.

An important discovery has just been made by Dr. Allan C. Johnson, who was Fellow at Johns Hopkins University last year and is now holding a Fellowship at the American School of Classical Studies at Athens. While pursuing his investigations on the Acropolis at Athens, Dr. Johnson was prompted to examine carefully the stones which compose the retaining wall of an ancient cistern and found that one of them had engraved upon it an inscription which had previously escaped observation because it was built into the wall in such a way that no letters were visible. When the slab was removed, the inscription proved to be an Attic decree of 303 B. C. which was enacted in honor of Nikon of Abydos for having saved Athenians from drowning in a previous war. This valuable document, which is thirty lines in length and contains

<sup>1</sup> See THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 3.146-147.

historical information hitherto quite unknown, will be published by the discoverer at an early date.

Dr. Johnson is a native of Nova Scotia, a Bachelor of Arts of Dalhousie University in 1904 and Doctor of Philosophy in the Johns Hopkins University in 1909. As his doctoral dissertation had to do with the Attic Decrees down to 300 B. C., he is especially to be congratulated on having made a contribution of lasting importance to the material which formed the basis of his previous researches.

H. L. WILSON.

I regret the editorial revision of my 'quip' on *primus*, Aen. 1.1., which allowed Dr. Kent (see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 3.150), to think that I had overlooked Professor Bennett's interesting note.

My objection, however, to the versions, 'first came', 'first to come', 'erst', 'at the first', 'in ancient times', seems to have survived editorial treatment. So I will again venture to find Professor Bennett's somewhat obscure note unsatisfactory: "merely that he marks the first beginnings (sic) of the Roman race". And now I will add Dr. Kent's own, "the first Roman".

Surely the source of a river is not the river itself—a *fortiori*, when it is one of two sources. Aeneas was no "Roman", not even the "first". Indeed Juno (Aen. 12. 833 ff.) asks and obtains from Jupiter:

Sermonem Ausonii patrium moresque tenebunt,  
utque est, nomen erit; commixti corpore tantum  
subsident Teuceri; morem ritusque sacrorum  
adiciam faciamque omnis uno ore Latinos.  
Hinc genus Ausonio mixtum quod sanguine surget,  
etc.

Nor would Vergil, fond as he is of parallelism, find it desirable in the terse ringing opening sentence of his epic to convey by *primus* the meaning 'the first Roman' and then add 'source whence the Latin race, the Alban fathers'.

I come back then to the well-known use of *primus* as *princeps* or *dux* (cf. e. g. 1. 24). So I find the meaning more significant, as portraying a heaven-directed leader of the Trojan 'remnant', with its civilization, its gods—a spiritual germ that should fructify the sluggish Ausonian race, and through amalgamation produce Roma Sempiterna.

EDGAR S. SHUMWAY.

The Classical Association of New England will hold its annual meeting at Hartford, on April 1-2; Professor Lodge will represent The Classical Association of the Atlantic States at this meeting. Similarly Professor Knapp will be a delegate from The Classical Association of the Atlantic States at the meeting of The Classical Association of the Middle West and South, at Chicago, April 29-30. Professor J. E. Harry, of the University of Cincinnati, will represent the latter Association on April 22-23 at the meeting of the C. A. A. S.

## THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY is published by the Classical Association of the Atlantic States. It is issued weekly, on Saturdays, from October to May inclusive, except in weeks in which there is a legal or school holiday, at Teachers College, 525 West 120th Street, New York City.

The dates of issue of Volume III will be as follows: in 1909, October 2, 9, 16, 23, 30; November 13, 20; December 4, 11, 18; in 1910, January 8, 15, 22, 29; February 5, 12, 19; March 5, 12, 19; April 2, 9, 16, 23, 30; May 7, 14, 21, 28.

All persons within the territory of the Association who are interested in the literature, the life and the art of ancient Greece and ancient Rome, whether actually engaged in teaching the Classics or not, are eligible to membership in the Association. Application for membership may be made to the Secretary-Treasurer, Charles Knapp, Barnard College, New York. The annual dues (which cover also the subscription to THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY), are two dollars. Within the territory covered by the Association (New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, District of Columbia, Virginia) subscription is possible to individuals only through membership. To institutions in this territory the subscription price is one dollar per year.

To persons and institutions outside the territory of the Association the subscription price of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY is one dollar per year. Single copies or extra copies ten cents each.

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY is conducted by the following board of editors:

### Editor-in-Chief

GONZALEZ LODGE, Teachers College, Columbia University  
*Associate Editors*

CHARLES KNAPP, Barnard College, Columbia University

ERNST RIESS, Boys' High School, Brooklyn

HARRY L. WILSON, Johns Hopkins University

### Business Manager

CHARLES KNAPP, Barnard College, New York City

Communications, articles, reviews, queries, etc., should be sent to the editor-in-chief. Inquiries concerning subscriptions and advertising, back numbers or extra numbers, notices of change of address, etc., should be sent to the business manager.

Printed by Princeton University Press, Princeton, N. J.

## TOWLE AND JENKS'S CAESAR'S GALLIC WAR

Text in clearer print than any other edition.  
Notes give exactly the help that pupils need.  
Grammatical Appendix contains all the grammar needed for reading Caesar.  
Vocabulary is made for pupils of ordinary capacity.

FOUR BOOKS \$1.00 SIX BOOKS \$1.25

D. C. HEATH & CO., PUBLISHERS  
BOSTON NEW YORK CHICAGO

## THE MASSAWIPPI SUMMER SCHOOL

Offers, for its third season, courses in Greek Drama, Latin and Greek Composition, Old French, Advanced French and German, Elementary Spanish and Italian, under Yale and Princeton instructors. The School is located in North Hatley, P. Q., by Lake Massawippi, near the Vermont line. Write

DR. C. U. CLARK,

473 Edgewood Ave., New Haven, Ct.,

for illustrated catalog.

HORACE MANN SCHOOL, New York City,

Jan. 27, 1910

"I was not brought up on Harkness's, but on another Latin grammar. When I took up teaching I used Harkness's because it seemed to me the best for the pupil. I used other grammars later, but always returned to Harkness's. If I were to-day to choose a grammar for pupils of academic age, I should select the present Harkness's."

HENRY C. PEARSON

AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY - Publishers

## A LARGE VOCABULARY

Can be acquired with the minimum amount of drudgery by students of Latin through the use of

### A MEMORY-TEST LATIN WORD-LIST

By George H. Browne, of the Browne and Nichols School, Cambridge, Mass.

This ingenious device provides the vocabularies of Caesar, Sallust, Nepos, Vergil's Aeneid I-IV, and all of Cicero's orations, grouped according to frequency of occurrence, with the English meanings so arranged that they may be instantly displayed or concealed for the conveniences of drill work. A circular with sample pages will be sent post-paid upon application.

GINN AND COMPANY : PUBLISHERS

70 Fifth Avenue : : New York City

## ABBOTT'S SHORT HISTORY OF ROME

An exceedingly interesting narrative, coupled with historical accuracy and balance in the treatment of periods, makes this book most desirable for an elementary course in the subject.

A large number of Maps and Illustrations.

PROF. FRANK FROST ABBOTT

Professor of Classics, Princeton University

A Short History of Rome - - - - - \$1.00  
Handbook for Study - - - - - .25

SCOTT, FORESMAN AND COMPANY

EDUCATIONAL PUBLISHERS

CHICAGO

ILLINOIS

## CAESAR: THE GALLIC WAR

By A. L. HODGES, Instructor in Latin in Wadleigh High School, New York. 12mo. Cloth. Illustrated. xiii + 522 pages. \$1.25 net.

The fourth book in the Macmillan Latin Series edited by J. C. Kirtland. It includes the seven books of the Commentaries, a comprehensive introduction, helpful notes, and a complete vocabulary.

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

64-66 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK  
BOSTON CHICAGO ATLANTA SAN FRANCISCO

## THE STUDENTS' SERIES OF LATIN CLASSICS

IMPORTANT NOTICE—The Johnston-Sanford Caesar (five books) is now furnished with Prose Composition.

PRICE, \$1.25

BENJ. H. SANBORN & CO.

24 WEST 39TH ST., - - - NEW YORK